

NOTICE OF MEETING
HILLSIDE REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ST. GEORGE
WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

Public Notice

Notice is hereby given that the Hillside Review Board of the City of St. George, Washington County, Utah, will hold meetings at the referenced site on **Wednesday, June 28, 2023**, commencing on-site at approximately 8:30 a.m.

PRESENT:

Dave Black
Jeff Mathis
James Dotson
Russ Owens

EXCUSED:

James Sullivan

CITY STAFF:

Assistant Public Works Director, Wes Jenkins
Planner III, Carol Davidson
Planner III, Michael Hadley
Development Office Supervisor, Brenda Hatch

The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

1. Consider a request for a preliminary hillside development review. This review would accompany a future general plan amendment and is a preliminary review of the hillside for a future commercial project. The property is currently zoned PD-R (Planned Development Residential). The site is located on the east side of Riverside Drive at approximately 700 South, south of Foremaster Drive. The applicant is Dave Nasal. Case No. 2023-HS-006.

James Dotson called the meeting to order.

Eric McFadden – The thought was to come up this gulch right here at the maximum 15% and then get to a pad elevation that splits the property the best. Which would essentially leave the cut along Riverside Drive. This hill would get pushed into that valley. You can see the old stakes over there from the adjacent property, which is the same owners. We are basically tying in at the same location. Then we will have a connection to the north. I believe I am going to be doing the engineering on that as well. On the commercial piece, so we can tie them together at the same time.

Dave Nasal – Not a full hillside application at this point, this is more of a discussion. We are looking to be able to knock this down, fill in the valleys and export some of it. Can we

make it work inside of hillside? Or do we pull it out of hillside? My personal feeling is that this stuff isn't the kind of stuff hillside is trying to protect.

Dave Black – I think there is a variety of things to protect. Natural features, rock outcroppings, natural hillside, and natural slope. The other problem as you know, dealing with the blue clay cuts, there is not a lot you can do with them. They are ugly, there is a lot of unravelling. You might cut back to a certain slope, but they are going to unravel to another slope. You can see that occurring down the hill and you leave a big scar. There are a variety of things to consider other than being in the overlay zone. You have the steep slopes and the ridge on top.

Eric McFadden – We haven't poked any holes in here yet Geotech wise to know if this is all clay or not. I know we hit rock on that little knoll there on the adjacent property. Wayne hasn't done anything here. That was kind of the idea of coming up here and flattening, so that any kind of cut we had would be hidden because you already have a 35 ft climb right off the road. With the buildings up here, I think it would hide anything that we have cut on this backside. You wouldn't necessarily see it from the road.

Dave Black – Historically, a long time ago they considered cutting this and Rosenberg did a design on this, one of the first simulations that we had to do was what the actual hill looked like and what the views were from the road coming off of Foremaster. The two major concerns was the blue clay and the sandstone back there to the northeast, so you are probably dealing with all blue clay. So, there are potentially slope stability issues. Your cut slopes will have to be looked at really close by AGEC. This is classified as a high potential hazard for slope stability and so their stability analysis might get kicked out of hillside and get a 3rd party review like we have done in the past. What they do here is pretty critical because they have a new development going in up above. With the plan that you submitted, it looks like some of your cuts go to the top.

Eric McFadden – Yes, that's if we stay at the 2:1, that was just throwing a 2:1 in there. If we did any kind of retaining down at the bottom, we could probably shorten that up a little bit. But like you said, retaining on blue clay probably isn't the best idea either. It's kind of the happy medium of where we picked the pad grades and the west had mentioned maybe something about coming off of Riverside and lowering the whole thing. We could look at doing something like that, I think it will just increase our cut on the backside. We could look into that scenario as well.

Discussion on matching the other site's grades.

Russ Owens – Instead of tying everything together, what is the chance of making individual pads, so you don't have quite so much cut and fill?

Eric McFadden – I think the issue is the climb off of Riverside. There might be a spot for it in this little ridge here, but I'm thinking of the climb.

Russ Owens – I don't know of anything that stays below 3:1 in the clay. By the time you do that you are so much into the top.

Jeff Mathis – So you think you would drop this hill 20 ft?

Dave Black – It's a tough one.

Eric McFadden – It's a rough site.

Russ Owens – Where would you take drainage?

Eric McFadden – We haven't even looked at that yet, it would have to be probably an underground system in the parking lot then out to Riverside.

Russ Owens – If you're in the clay then an underground system...

Eric McFadden – We wouldn't let it infiltrate; we would contain it.

Dave Black – So if you did something up here, would the City want you to do improvements along that road?

Wes Jenkins – They will have to do their portion.

Dan Boles – There are also landscaping requirements that will become an issue as well.

Dave Black – I think you will have to limit the landscaping because of the blue clay issues, that water is really problematic. There needs to be some type of waiver on that.

Dan Boles – If we got to the point where we had some type of full application then we would need to discuss that because it is in the code. It is something to keep in mind.

Russ Owens – Will the City require a new turning lane here? If so then the slope will be way cut back anyway.

James Dotson – I don't have any issue with this being disturbed here, it's the run, it's the catch all the way up the hill to the ridgeline.

Jeff Mathis – It's not beautiful, but there are some features. In the code you can't disturb over 40%. Unless it's noncontiguous or whatever.

Eric McFadden – So there's no issue with getting rid of the slope against the road?

Dan Boles – If I can jump in, your discussion today will accompany a general plan amendment that will go to the Planning Commission and City Council. If you could give your thoughts clearly organized so that we can present that to the Planning Commission and City Council so that they know what the Hillside Review Board thought about this project.

Dave Black – I think we could say that our concern would be limiting the amount of scarring and disturbance up the hill. And try not to exceed the amount of disturbance that has been recommended for approval on the adjacent properties. We met on that commercial piece and this piece, and the amount of disturbance should match or not exceed that. Not that it has to be continuous, but that it doesn't exceed that. That could be a goal or a guideline. I think again they really will need to get their geotechnical engineer

involved to address the geologic constraints with the site. The stable cut slopes, the blue clay issues and how they are going to address those. The potential of rockfall will need to be addressed as well. There are other issues, I don't know that we would have a concern with disturbing or extending the existing cuts back. Russ brought up if there is a way to cluster in pods or something, maybe look at that option.

James Dotson – I don't know how we make a recommendation based on the current layout because we don't want it to go up the hill to the top.

Dave Nasal – I think the General Plan Amendment is more for it to go to commercial. From PD-R.

Dave Black – Does that actually help it become more flexible or buildable?

Jeff Mathis – I think commercial is a better situation for this property than houses would be.

Eric McFadden – I think if we can get the General Plan recommendation for commercial then we just go back to the drawing boards to see if we can get some kind of design with less cut and some kind of rock stability walls or something.

Wes Jenkins – So you guys approve of them going to commercial on the General Plan change?

Dave Black, Jeff Mathis, Russ Owens, James Dotson – Yes.

2. Consider approval of the meeting minutes from the **April 26**, 2023, meeting.

MOTION: Dave Black made a motion to approve the minutes from the last meeting. SECOND: Jeff Mathis AYES (4) Dave Black Jeff Mathis Russ Owens James Dotson NAYS (0) Motion carries
--

James Dotson adjourned the meeting.